



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 3, 2005

Ms. Lavergne Schwender
Assistant County Attorney
Harris County
1019 Congress, 15th Floor
Houston, Texas 77002

OR2005-03785

Dear Ms. Schwender:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 223202.

The Purchasing Agent for Harris County (the "county") received a request for information related to a particular request for proposals. While you claim no exceptions to disclosure on behalf of the county, you inform us that you notified the interested third parties of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information should not be released.¹ See Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under the Act in certain circumstances). We have considered all claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information.

An interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. See Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this decision, SBC has not submitted to this office any reasons explaining why its information should not be released. Therefore, SBC has provided us with no basis to conclude that it has a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information, and none of the information may be withheld on that basis. See, e.g., Gov't Code § 552.110(b) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must

¹The following third parties received notice pursuant to section 552.305: First Data Government Solutions ("First Data"), Gold Systems ("Gold"), Electronic Transaction Consultants ("ETC"), and Southwestern Bell ("SBC").

show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990).

ETC asserts that information pertaining to it is excepted from public disclosure under section 552.104 of the Government Code. Section 552.104 excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." The purpose of section 552.104 is to protect a governmental body's interests in competitive bidding situations. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 (1991). Section 552.104 is not designed to protect the interests of private parties that submit information to a governmental body. *See id.* at 8-9. The county does not argue that the release of any of the submitted information would harm the county's interests in a particular competitive situation. Therefore, no portion of the submitted information pertaining to ETC is excepted from disclosure under section 552.104 of the Government Code.

Third parties ETC and First Data have submitted comments to this office contending that portions of the information that each company submitted to the county are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. You have forwarded to this office a letter from Gold requesting that portions of its information not be released. We will treat that letter as a response under section 552.305 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990).

Section 552.110 of the Government Code protects the property interests of private persons by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (1) trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision and (2) commercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a), (b).

The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex.), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (1958); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 2 (1990). Section 757 provides that a trade secret is

any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives him an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it. It may be a formula for a chemical compound, a process of manufacturing, treating or preserving materials, a pattern for a machine or other device, or a list of customers. It differs from other secret information in a business . . . in that it is not simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the

operation of the business. . . . [It may] relate to the sale of goods or to other operations in the business, such as a code for determining discounts, rebates or other concessions in a price list or catalogue, or a list of specialized customers, or a method of bookkeeping or other office management.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). In determining whether particular information constitutes a trade secret, this office considers the Restatement's definition of trade secret as well as the Restatement's list of six trade secret factors.² *Id.* This office has held that if a governmental body takes no position with regard to the application of the trade secret branch of section 552.110 to requested information, we must accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under that branch if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for exception and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5-6 (1990). However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) applies unless it has been shown that the information meets the definition of a trade secret and the necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained[.]" Gov't Code § 552.110(b). Section 552.110(b) requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *See* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (stating that business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm); *see also National Parks & Conservation Ass'n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

Upon review of the submitted information and arguments, we find that Gold, ETC, and First Data have made specific factual or evidentiary showings that the release of some of the information each seeks to withhold would cause these companies substantial competitive harm. This information, which we have marked, must be withheld pursuant to

²The six factors that the Restatement gives as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret are:

(1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company]; (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and others involved in [the company's] business; (3) the extent of measures taken by [the company] to guard the secrecy of the information; (4) the value of the information to [the company] and [its] competitors; (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing the information; (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

section 552.110(b). However, we find that Gold, ETC, and First Data have not shown that any of the remaining information each seeks to withhold meets the definition of a trade secret or that its release would cause that company substantial competitive harm. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 509 at 5 (1988) (because costs, bid specifications, and circumstances would change for future contracts, assertion that release of bid proposal might give competitor unfair advantage on future contracts was entirely too speculative), 319 at 3 (1982) (statutory predecessor to section 552.110 generally not applicable to information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing). Therefore, the remaining submitted information may not be withheld pursuant to section 552.110.

We note that the remaining submitted records contain insurance policy numbers that are subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code. This section provides that “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.” Gov’t Code § 552.136. Accordingly, the county must withhold these insurance policy numbers pursuant to section 552.136 of the Government Code.

Lastly, we note that portions of the submitted information not excepted from disclosure may be protected by copyrighted. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

In summary, the county must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.110. Insurance policy numbers must be withheld under section 552.136. The county must release the remaining submitted information in accordance with applicable copyright law.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov’t Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days.

Id. § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).


If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/kr1

Ref: ID# 223202

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Ken Jones
HTIS, Inc.
6001 Stonington #196
Houston, Texas 77040
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Marybeth McManus
First Data Government Solutions
11311 Cornell Park Dr., Ste. 300
Cincinnati, Ohio 45242
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Claudette McCamley
Southwestern Bell
6500 West Loop South, Zone 5.3
Bellaire, Texas 77401
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Kelly Houston
Gold Systems
1780 Conestoga Street
Boulder, Co 80301
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Matt Corbin
First Data Government Solutions
2939 Twin Knolls Drive
Kingwood, Texas 77339
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Tim Gallagher
Electronic Transaction Consultants
1200 Executive Drive East, Ste. 100
Richardson, Texas 75081
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Spencer Bartlett
Haynes and Boone, L.L.P.
600 Congress Avenue, Ste.1300
Austin, Texas 78701-3285
(w/o enclosures)